USDC SDNY

JAMES BOPP, JR.1

Senior Associates RICHARD E. COLESONI

BARRY A. BOSTROMI

Associates RANDY ELF

JEFFREY P. GALLANT

ANITA Y. WOUDENBERGI

JOSIAH S. NEELEY

CLAYTON J. CALLENS

JOSEPH E. LA RUE®

'adnetted in Ind

Fadmitted in NY and Penn

admitted in Va.

admitted in Tex. Sadmitted in Mo.

fadmined in Oh.

## BOPP, COLESON & BOSTROM

ATTORNEYS AT LAW (not a partnership)

THE NATIONAL BUILDING 1 South Sixth Street TERRE HAUTE, INDIANA 47807-3510

Telephone 812/232-2434 Facsimile 812/235-3685

E-MAIL ADDRESSES jboppjr@aol.com rcoleson@bopplaw.com bbostrom@bopplaw.com relf@bopplaw.com jgallant@bopplaw.com awoudenberg@bopplaw.com jneeley@bopplaw.com ccallen@bopplaw.com jlaruc@bopplaw.com

## EMO ENDUISE

September 3, 2008

Honorable Laura Taylor Swain United States District Judge

United States Courthouse

500 Pearl Street

New York, New York

Re: Ognibene v. Parkes

08 CV 1335 (LTS) (TDK)

Plaintiffs' Request for Sur Reply

By Facsimile Transmission: 212-805-0426

Dear Judge Swain:

We represent the plaintiffs in Ognibene v. Parkes (08 CV 1335). Yesterday, after speaking with Mr. Jon Pines, counsel for the defendants, we faxed a letter to Your Honor asking for leave to file a sur reply. We incorporate that letter here by reference.

Mr. Pines sent us an email last night expressing reservations regarding our sur reply request and indicating a copy would be furnished to the Court this morning. While we had been in dialogue with opposing counsel, in the interest of appraising the Court of all aspects of this dispute we now submit this letter, furnishing a copy concurrently to Mr. Pines.

In his letter, which Mr. Pines indicated would be delivered to the Court this morning, he alleges that we, the counsel for the plaintiffs, misled him. This is a serious accusation. We write to (1) object to that characterization and (2) ask that Your Honor either allow us to file a sur reply or else strike defendants' reply brief for being improper, as well as too long.

## Plaintiffs' Counsel Did Not Mislead Mr. Pines

When I spoke with Mr. Pines yesterday, I indicated to him our desire to file a sur reply. I explained to him that if your Honor allows us that reply, we will (a) explain that we agree with the

3/3

Honorable Laura Taylor Swain September 3, 2008 Page 2

defendants that Randall-type claims, requiring the plaintiffs to develop a factual record, are not properly before the Court at this stage of the litigation, but that (b) Count II of plaintiffs' amended complaint involves more than Randall-type claims, and so it is properly before the Court. I also explained to Mr. Pines that I would not address those points in the letter, prior to Your Honor granting permission for us to file a sur reply. I also explained that, in order to ask for a sur reply, we would have to provide Your Honor some basis for granting it. I was true to my word. Plaintiffs' letter (1) asked for leave to file a sur reply; (2) did not address the issues we will discuss in the sur reply (if Your Honor grants us leave to file one); and (3) gave Your Honor a basis for granting our request, by pointing out that Part 6 of their brief is improper. Far from misleading Mr. Pines, we did what we said we would do.

## Your Honor Should Strike Defendants' Reply Brief; In The Alternative, She Should Grant Plaintiffs Leave To File a Sur Reply

It is not only Part 6 of the defendants' brief that is improper. Actually, much if not all of their brief is an argument against plaintiffs' request for final judgment stemming from their preliminary injunction motion. As such, it is an improper reply and should be stricken. Additionally, the brief is longer than the ten pages Your Honor allows for reply briefs. While both sides requested and received leave to exceed the page limit for previous briefs, no such request was made for this one. It should therefore be stricken.

In the alternative, for the reasons we stated in our letter yesterday, the Court should grant plaintiffs leave to file a sur reply addressing only the narrow issue of whether Count II is properly before this Court at this stage of the litigation.

Sincerely,

BOPP, COLESON & BOSTROM

James Bopp, Jr. Joe La Rue

These briefs must be limited

to the Count II Randaul issue described in the parties' correspondence

and shall not socied to pages

in length (12 pt type thraphout, including furthers, and I" margins).

Jon Pines, Esq. (by email) c: Counsel for Defendants

> Charles Capetanakis, Esq. (by email) Local Counsel for Plaintiffs

Mark Spund, Esq. (by email) Local Counsel for Plaintiffs

SO ORDERED.

Sept 4, , 2008 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE